

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,869	02/17/2004	Robert F. D'Ausilio	IOS9601-CIPD	1482
7.	7590 10/19/2005		EXAMINER	
Giaccherini			SWIATEK, ROBERT P	
Post Office Box	x 1146			
Carmel Valley, CA 93924			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/779,869	D'AUSILIO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert P. Swiatek	3643			
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lation. Ty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON By statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION.  reply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed o</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice of</li> </ul>	☑ This action is non-final.  allowance except for formal mat	• •			
Disposition of Claims	•	·			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-85</u> is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2 and 4-85</u> is/s 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	are withdrawn from consideration	n.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-1449)	948) Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-1-04 et al.  6) Other:					

## **DETAILED ACTION**

In accordance with the election filed 25 July 2005, claims 1, 3 have been given an action on the merits; claims 2, 4-85 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article entitled "Nuclear Electric Propulsion of Spacecraft" by Martin (reference 2A on Information Disclosure Statement filed 18 July 2005). The article describes—and Figure 6 illustrates—a design for a nuclear spacecraft to be operated in Earth orbit. The spacecraft includes a radiation shield (inherent in the design of a nuclear power system, but essentially the conical "shadow shielding" shown below the power generating module of the left-hand portion of Figure 6 of Martin and described on page 520, column 1, lines 1-3, of the reference) and a docking unit, deemed to constitute a "grasping means" for interacting with other satellites. The spacecraft would possess kinetic energy by virtue of its orbital motion; the kinetic energy of the craft during a docking procedure would necessarily cause at least slight angular movement of any satellite with which the nuclear spacecraft was docking.

Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as

Application/Control Number: 10/779,869

Art Unit: 3643

the invention. Claim 1, line 1, is unclear in that it does not express a specified function for the

Page 3

method.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 1, "is disclosed" should be

deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2, the

relationships of each recited US patent application, i.e., continuation, continuation-in-part, to the

instant application and to each other are not set forth in the accepted manner. Moreover, in

line10, the missing serial number should be provided.

Appropriate correction is required.

The patents to Fogarty (US Re. 27,903), Myers (US 4,718,709), Howard (US 4,750,692),

and Gernhardt et al. (US 5,320,395) have been cited to provide additional examples of satellite

capturing and grasping implements.

RPS: ②571/272-6894

12 October 2005

PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 32 3643